

Some Opinion on the Notion of Geo-Economic Security

Giorgi Kvinikadze

PhD in Human Geography, Assistant Professor, State university, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Department of Human Geography. Tbilisi, Chavchavadze Ave. 1 Georgia

Abstract: The study is of empirical character and methodologically is thought in the category of qualitative studies. The purpose of this article is to answer question: What is the essence of geo-economic Security? According to the author geoeconomic approach determines the priorities of global and national security, generates the motivation of actions in the global space and forms new values.

Keywords: geo-economics, geo-economic security, nation-state, economic stability, government's policy.

1. INTRODUCTION

Problem actuality. At the contemporary stage of development, internationalization has entered its closing phase and the world is getting more and more united not only in the philosophical sense but in reality as well. Nowadays the world is trying to search for a new starting point of the dynamic equilibrium in three directions simultaneously: geo-economic, geopolitical and geostrategic. This process is being covered by a new, new economic model of civilization. Military might is losing its traditional role of determining the states' hierarchy, which was used by geopolitics not so long ago. In the post-Cold War period, geopolitics and geostrategy have executed a special function only in exceptional cases, while geo-economics has become the major determinant of the world order. In the present situation, geo-economic approach determines the priorities of global and national security, generates the motivation of actions in the global space and forms new values.

The object of the research Geo-economic security (GES) - theoretical analysis of the essence of GES in the context of existing conflicts. For the fulfillment of this goal, we have analyzed the views and arguments of famous scientists in the field.

The goal of the research. Analysis of the GES concepts.

The main question is - Which factors represent the GES determinants under the conditions of economic globalization and what is their impact on the nation-state?

The hypothesis. High standard of GES is achieved only by liberalizing national economies.

The novelty and practical value. Considering the GES in the conceptual analysis context makes the work scientifically valuable. Moreover, putting forward the conceptual foundations for the GES is very relevant for national security strategy. Bringing new factors and parameters into the GES conception and establishing a new look under the conditions of devaluation of the essence of its main determinants also increases the practical value of the research.

In order to create a comparatively complete picture depicting the GES conceptualization problems, we can go back to the analysis of the GES definition observed in the western scientific literature. In this respect, we believe that Cable's (Cable,1995) scientific work contains most important information regarding this issue. Though the article is dedicated to international economic security, the typology of the approaches suggested by the author can be used in the geoeconomic

security (with certain amendments). Thus, relying on this typology we construct our own GES for a nation-state. These approaches can be formulated in the following way:

- GES as a condition for realizing the government's economic policy goals;
- GES as a condition of the country's stable economic development;
- GES as an economic dimension of the country's geopolitical security;
- GES as a condition of suppression of illegal economic activities;
- GES as a condition for providing the increasing competitiveness;
- GES as a means for penetrating into the raw materials and sales market.

2. EXPOSITION OF BASIC MATERIAL

While dealing with the goals responding to the interests of a society or nation-state, it becomes possible to give a much wider interpretation to GES. According to the given interpretation, in such a case the major thing is to enable a government to carry out the chosen policy independently. On the one hand, this definition makes sense if the goals are of objective character, but if the interpretation is subjective, the GES conception turns into a toy in the hands of politically engaged forces having their own ideas concerning the goals that should be achieved by the government in the economic sphere. On the other hand, the idea that any government should acquire complete freedom in determining economic policy and its realization seriously contradicts to the democratic political system realities the inseparable part of which is civil society and the reaction of its subjects to the impulses political decisions. As a result, this kind of understanding of GES is favorable mostly for authoritarian and non-democratic regimes.

One of the most popular determinants of GES is "stability". It is noteworthy that this approach is not unequivocal. First of all because of the very fact that the instability phenomenon immanently accompanies market economy (we consider it pointless to use the term "sustainable" in this context). Here arises a question: what is the difference between "destructive stability" and "creative stability?" It is a fact that creative stability initiates economic, structural and technological transformations. On the other hand, the investigators who chose this approach will definitely face the dilemma whether it suffices to be limited with only economic issues or to foresee other dangers as well. It is obvious that in the former case the scope of analysis gets narrower, while in the latter there is a danger that GES problem area will expand infinitely (be it geopolitical, ecological, humanitarian, etc.) with the determinants of geo-economic "stability".

I full attention is concentrated on those geo-economic conditions which provide military-technological and military-political priorities (control over military technologies, the spread of strategic resources, etc). Such approach gives a possibility to integrate the investigation of GES problems into the priority system connected with national security. It is evident that such integration means that GES conception has no independent object of exploration and it belongs not to the range of economic sciences, but to international security which represents one of the applied aspects of GES theory. We are not going to claim that this approach is a priori unacceptable (this is the most admitted approach for specialists working in the field of international security). Though the geo-economic position lies in the fact that this approach concerns only one aspect of GES problematics, therefore it should be discussed in a wider context.

The conception of GES practically goes beyond the frame of economic science and moves to the sphere of jurisprudence, partly presenting the result of the terminological trap which is connected with "security". Indeed, if the norms of national or international law forbid this or that kind of economic activities, does a violation of norms represent a danger to "security?". From the point of view of its content, this question contains some ambiguity. For example, let us discuss a situation of avoiding taxes, which is admitted as another danger to the GES by many experts.

What is a real danger for the GES, in such a case, not paying taxes or the taxes themselves being too high to make businesses profitable? All in all, the objective of business is to satisfy the consumers' demands and not to pay high taxes. Quite infrequently as an answer to the question "Why is a shadowy business bad?" we hear, "Because businessman does not pay taxes". We can understand when such an answer when it is given by a tax office clerk, but when a professional economist is of the same opinion, it proves that he does not fully understand the essence of the problem. Thus, considerable development of "shadowy business" represents a method of adjusting the repressive taxation system, which promotes the GES and not its danger. Such argument is surely unacceptable for purely criminal kinds of business, such as

narco trade, prostitution, trafficking and others, but it makes it possible to reveal the GES conceptual disadvantages within this approach.

We have to note that geo-economic perspectives have gained huge popularity in the GES problem interpretation. In this respect, the most arguable question is: "To what extent is competitiveness a specific security dimension if it is an object of certain companies (transnational among them) and their lobbies trying to influence a government's policy?" Along with that, if the notion of "competitiveness" causes pure technical disagreements on the level of individual enterprises and other branches of economics, the term "state competitiveness" raises serious conceptual questions. At present, the wide-scale effort in elaborating the indices of the countries' competitiveness is seen in the World Economic Forum publications (The Global Competitiveness Report: 2001-2002; 2004-2005; 2010-2011; 2015-2016). In this case, it is not a matter of global rivalry of national economies conferring a conceptual dimension to the economic interaction among the countries at the global arena (and causing the shift of the economic policy oriented to raising national competitiveness, may factually turn into the continuation of the war by using different means), but more significant is the circumstance that at present the conception of a state's competitiveness lacks a kind of firm, analytical foundation providing a possibility of its simple and unambiguous interpretation. For example: "Is it necessary for a country to claim for the leading positions in competitiveness to be a leader in all the fields of economy or is it suffice to be a leader in the sphere of high technologies?" If the answer to the second part of the question is "yes" then what are the criteria for distinguishing the "leading" fields and how real is the expectation that any state is able to preserve the leadership in all the fields (considering the limited economic and technological resources and the process of globalization of modern economy) where the rate of interdependence of states is rather high? Finally, we must note that this very approach is rather popular with geo-economists and international relations specialists, though the approach of professional economists remains rather critical.

GES as an access to raw materials and sales markets- the given issue is mostly connected with the moment when the GES determinant is "stability", as far as the accessibility of the corresponding markets can be conceived as a factor of undisturbed functioning of economy. Speaking about the accessibility of strategic resources, the given approach approximates the third, military-political one. If it implies that national companies are more or less dependent on foreign markets (i.e. are buying or selling commodities and services for the production process), it would be interesting to learn how expedient it is to consider the interests of these companies as a constituent element of security at the national level. It is apparent that in this case, the accessibility of the markets cannot be comprehensive for the GES potential contents.

3. CONCLUSIONS

The variety of conceptual approaches within the GES, their contradictions and unclear subjective area (intruding into the problems of geo-politics, economics, geography, ecology, international relations, jurisprudence and others) naturally, there rises a need to give an answer to the following question: Is the GES the sphere of rhetoric or a science? The answer is hidden in revealing all the methodological aspects of the GES conception, which is going to be a subject of our further research.

REFERENCES

- [1] Cable, V. (1995). *What is International Economic Security?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [2] The Global Competitiveness Report: 2001-2002. Available at:
- [3] <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.476.4940&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- [4] The Global Competitiveness Report: 2004-2005. Available at:
- [5] http://www.ieseinsight.com/casos/study_0035.pdf
- [6] The Global Competitiveness Report: 2010-2011. Available at:
- [7] http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GlobalCompetitivenessReport_2010-11.pdf
- [8] The Global Competitiveness Report, 2015. Available at:
- [9] <http://reports.weforum.org/global-competitiveness-report-2015-2016/>